25

(Case called) 1 2 (In open court; defendant present) 3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please rise. 4 THE COURT: How are you, please be seated. 5 Okay, so nice to see you all. 6 As you know from my order dated May 27th, I didn't 7 think I was ready to go forward with the sentencing today, because I as indicated in that order, there are some things 8 9 that are missing and that would be helpful. 10 So, Mr. Hernandez, we had asked someone from probation 11 to be here, particularly the people who prepare the presentence 12 But, so far, no response. And we did send an e-mail, 13 so maybe you could convey what I'm looking for, because I think 14 in large measure it is the probation presentence report that 15 has some gaps that I would like to try and fill in. MR. HERNANDEZ: We'll do that, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Great. Thanks so much. So let me go over what they are, just so it's clear. 18 19 So the presentence report is helpful in the sense that 20 it, you know, recounts much of the testimony and evidence 21 adduced at trial. That's sort of less helpful at this stage. 22 Everyone knows -- having some more background on Mr. 23 Kurniawan's motivation, personal history, interviews, et 24 cetera, that's really -- I mean most of us know what happened

at the trial. What we don't know is that. So I would like the

probation department to -- and I would like them to do it forthwith -- to try and develop a little bit more of that information.

For example, they mentioned that Mr. Kurniawan's mother is still living in the house in LA; is that right?

MR. MOONEY: Yes, your Honor. She still is. And

MR. MOONEY: Yes, your Honor. She still is. And she's been expecting somebody to call her.

THE COURT: Yeah, me too.

MR. MOONEY: And as of yesterday, she had not been contacted.

THE COURT: Yeah, I get that.

And so there is mention of the need for a Mandarin interpreter, but I'm sure there are plenty available, and so that should happen.

For example, she was, as we all know, also living there at the time of Mr. Kurniawan's arrest. So she's someone -- and as a mother, would have perhaps some insight.

So that would be helpful.

And what about other family members; brothers. Are they amenable to being interviewed, or --

MR. MOONEY: Yes, your Honor. There are two brothers. One of them speaks pretty good English. The other one has very poor English. And we are gonna see what we can do to try to make some connections to at least make that contact. They are both located in Asia, but --

THE COURT: What's the language that the one who doesn't speak such good English is, principally?

MR. MOONEY: He would speak Indonesian. And Chinese. They all speak Chinese.

THE COURT: Mandarin?

MR. MOONEY: Yes.

THE COURT: Perhaps the same interpreter for the mother --

MR. MOONEY: That would be possible.

THE COURT: There are ways to fix that. And I think it would make our job more easier.

MR. MOONEY: Okay.

THE COURT: So, okay then. This is in the presentence report. You all are aware there is a net worth column of 8 million, plus. That can't be. Net worth is usually assets minus liabilities. They didn't minus any liability. So that's an incorrect statement. And it doesn't -- it's not just technical. We need to know, for these issues of restitution and forfeiture, et cetera, et cetera, what the numbers are. And they don't add up in the presentence report, so we need much more in depth. And perhaps that's something you can help the probation department with.

MR. HERNANDEZ: We are happy to do that.

There are also assets, for example, that are not accounted for in the report. So there are some gaps. And we

have some resources that we can help probation to provide a more complete report.

THE COURT: Great. And you're welcome, Mr. Mooney, to weigh in on that process also.

MR. MOONEY: We'll see what we can do to help out with that.

THE COURT: So then, as you know, the probation department makes a recommendation that the sentence should be below the guidelines sentence they computed. And, you know, I'm happy to have their thoughts on the matter, but they really don't explain why it goes from, presumably, from 168 to 120 and not to 80 or some other number. I mean there is no rationale. And that would be useful and helpful. The numbers, in and of themselves, don't really tell us much. So that would be important.

So does anybody know -- another matter, I have this letter from William Koch. It is undated. Is there a date that I should fix to that letter?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor, Mr. Koch's lawyers sent me a copy of the letter with the date, May 22nd, which I can hand up to your deputy.

THE COURT: Oh, great. I can substitute that letter with the undated one.

MR. HERNANDEZ: You could. I think it's the exact same letter, they just put the date on it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. So that's helpful.

And I'll make this part of the docket, his letter. We'll post it, if it is not already posted.

There is reference in two places to Mr. Koch's letter, presumably, to the Court. I don't think I have seen that.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, your Honor, if I might bring that forward.

THE COURT: Great. So we'll make that, also, a court exhibit.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Just for the record, Mr. Mooney, it is dated 2014?

MR. MOONEY: That's correct, your Honor.

MR. HERNANDEZ: And I do --

THE COURT: Counsel, that --

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm sure we are going to get inquiries about this in our sentencing submission. We argued that documents, such as these, if your Honor is going to rely on them, should be part of the public record.

THE COURT: I usually say all submissions go on the public record. So if they have not, I'll put them on there. But you all should, too.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I ask only because these good people here will call our press office as soon as this proceeding is over, and they'll ask whether that is a public record. So it

is helpful to have that clarification.

MR. MOONEY: We have no objection, your Honor. It's been our practice to send those in through probation.

THE COURT: Yeah, no, I know.

MR. MOONEY: The way we usually do it, that's why it happened that way.

THE COURT: I can confirm that those are three good people, by the way.

So we'll -- yeah, we will put this on. And if you do it, too, you know, it doesn't matter.

So, now, just to -- because this looks like a somewhat more complicated issue, and from the materials as well, Mr. Hernandez. Is it likely, or possible, or probable in this case, that we'll have three different numbers; one for restitution, one for forfeiture, one for actual and intended loss.

Could you give us just a little preview of what you think is happening there?

MR. HERNANDEZ: I do think, your Honor, we're going to have, probably, three different numbers. The actual loss represents the fake bottles that were sold. And intended loss, as I'm sure your Honor knows, includes bottles, for example, that were consigned, or withdrawn, or sales that were never consummated. That's gonna be the largest number, because of the inclusion of the intended loss.

THE COURT: And that number is, among other reasons, significant, because it drives the guideline range.

MR. HERNANDEZ: It does. But I'll make one observation, which is that there is really only a two-point difference in the guidelines range between the parties. The government says, when you combine intended loss and actual loss, it is between 20 and 50 million. And Mr. Mooney's most recent submission says that the, you know, the actual loss or maybe the total loss, is a little over 7 million.

THE COURT: Up to 20.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Up to 20, right.

So when you look at the guideline breakdown, the two breaks are seven to twenty million and twenty to fifty. So we're talking about a two-point difference. In the end, we'll still obviously need to be accurate. And we're doing as best we can because — so you have the largest number of intended and actual loss. Then you have the forfeiture number, which is probably the second largest number. That's the proceeds gained from the sale of the fake wines.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. HERNANDEZ: And then the last number, restitution, is probably the smallest number, because there were people who got refunds, for example. So Mr. Kurniawan would swap the bottles and give them either some authentic wine or return money, or an option house would.

So in the area of restitution, to use the prime example, William Koch, Mr. Koch, decided not to return his bottles. He has estimated he has 2.1 million or so fake bottles that he bought from Mr. Kurniawan. He would be eligible for restitution in that amount.

THE COURT: So if he decides, for example, not to return them, but he's still entitled to restitution? I mean if he returned them, he would get -- presumably, he would get something for them, no?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, he would get pennies on the dollar, I think is fair to say, certainly, at this point. I don't know what would have happened if he returned them in 2006. But there are — certainly are arguments that they are worthless. So I don't know that anyone is going to return them or accept them at this point.

There is also evidence in his civil suit against Mr. Kurniawan, there are all sorts of reasons, there are other people who, for different reasons, have kept their bottles, as well. And what we have attempted to do, although it is difficult to do — because not everyone is as transparent as Mr. Koch, or willing to put their information on the line — is to look at what other victims have had in terms of their losses. And some have had, Mr. Eagan, the expert who testified, looked through cellars and created their lists. Some are not as precise. And we tried to be conservative in

that regard.

There are a handful of people who bought in excess of \$10 million of wine, combined. All of the very, very likely counterfeited kinds of wines. The rarest. The most expensive. The large formats. And those people are much more hesitant to come forward. We could subpoen those people and say show us what you bought and let's -- we could subpoen and say give us the bottles. But then we would have to take months and a lot of dollars to then go through their wines to estimate the loss amount, which is probably not a wise use of resources.

So given that there is a two-point difference here, and for restitution purposes we'll only submit a restitution request for victims that have provided some form of documentation for their losses, it's gonna be the smallest number.

THE COURT: So stay on that for a moment.

So the two-point difference gets you -- what are the two guideline ranges that -- that result from that two-point difference?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Sure, I wrote them down on the presentence report. If you give me a second, I can flip to that.

THE COURT: One is the 165 to -- I think it's -- that's what it is.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Right. That's the range that the

probation and the government have. That's at a level 35. And then at a level 33, which is the two-point difference for loss, the range is 135 to 168.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. MOONEY: And that's if you just go from the presentence report, your Honor. There are some other issues obviously unrelated to loss.

THE COURT: Right, right, right.

MR. MOONEY: Okay. And I might add that with regard to the restitution issue, the defense, we are in litigation with Mr. Koch. So we have conversations there. But we have also been trying to reach out to some of the other people we know about, try to work out whatever differences there might be in regards to what those people are entitled to, and get them some money, if possible.

THE COURT: Right.

Now, are those situations going to be netted out, so to speak, before we get to fixing the restitution number here. Because I guess if somebody got paid, he wouldn't -- wouldn't need restitution. So I noticed --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Right.

THE COURT: -- in the government's submission, there is a whole series of people who got reimbursed from, I don't know --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Right. We wouldn't submit restitution

orders for those individuals. But it is in there, included because it's intended loss. It shows you how much they bought, they got to return it, but --

MR. MOONEY: I do not know, your Honor, whether we'll have those things wrapped up and settled. I mean it is really quite fascinating, even with the numbers being where they are, the difficulty we are having getting some people to even want to talk about it.

THE COURT: You mean buyers?

MR. MOONEY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MOONEY: People we want to give money to.

THE COURT: Right.

So we have to figure out how we're going to go about dealing with that. And one thing -- just as a heads up -- I like to do. Sometimes we get to sentencing and then somebody will say, well, Judge, we'll have the restitution within 90 days. I want to have it before the sentencing so that we can really wrap things up. So that will mean, as best it can be, Mr. Hernandez, we'll need the list of names, how much they get, addresses, where the restitution goes to, all of that. And to the extent that you and Mr. Mooney can agree on that, obviously that would be ideal, the greater extent the agreement, the better it will be.

MR. HERNANDEZ: We'll work to eliminate whatever

disagreements there are. If there are, we'll identify them.

You know, at the end of the day, your Honor, I think that there are certainly two victims that we, I think, have very, very well documented losses for. That's Mr. Koch and Mr. Fascitelli.

THE COURT: And that total is, roughly?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Almost \$8 million. And I think our argument, as a fall-back argument here, because it is difficult to calculate some of these losses for different reasons, is that if your Honor concludes that they suffered approximately \$8 million worth of losses — and there are some other individuals with very, very clear losses, they are just smaller amounts — and that the intended loss in this case is in excess of \$13 million, based on consignments and based on what was found in the home, that already puts you into the 20 to 50 million-dollar range.

We're not interested in unnecessarily creating disputed issues of fact over losses that may be too difficult to pin down. So we'll try and resolve those differences and make it clearer.

THE COURT: Right. So that was going to be my next question, that we'll be able to resolve all those issues Mr. Mooney and Mr. Hernandez, on the papers? Or is there going to have to be some sort of hearing. What is your thought about that?

MR. MOONEY: I don't know that we know that, your
Honor. We're probably okay with -- we'll be able to figure out
where we are with regard to the actual loss issue, with regard
to the things that are happening. And we're probably okay with
something in the neighborhood of the 8 million-dollar range. I
think where we probably have a lot of difficulty is with regard
to this sort of intended range, because there is so many things
that have been thrown into that that we think just are
improbable and just don't meet the level where the Court should
seriously consider them. But I don't know that that is the
sort of thing that would be the subject of a hearing, as much
as something we can probably adequately handle with briefing.
We have certainly given the Court a lot of briefing on those
subjects.

THE COURT: You certainly have. I have a 575 page submission from you.

MR. MOONEY: I apologize for that. Also apologize for, and deeply distressed with, Fed-Ex. We put that package with Fed-Ex on Saturday, and find out that it didn't get delivered to the Court until yesterday.

THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah --

MR. MOONEY: And they are supposed to be the gold standard.

THE COURT: -- you can rest assured that we have it all. I can't say we have absorbed it all, but we have it all.

So, all right, I think that's it.

I have one other question. Do we anticipate any victim testimony, or are we gonna have this all on letters or submissions.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I don't think so, your Honor. I think Mr. Koch's letter is -- I don't think he intends to attend in person. And I have spoken to -- a couple of the wine makers at one point had expressed an interest, but since they testified, I don't think there is gonna be anything more.

THE COURT: Great, okay. So, all right, again, if you would impress upon the probation department that I really need this information. And also bring to their attention the dates by which this is supposed to happen, which are set forth in the order dated May 27, 2014, then we'll by in pretty good shape, it seems to me.

MR. HERNANDEZ: We'll do that.

THE COURT: Okay.

So now the question is what is the alternative sentence date. I think Mr. Mooney was hoping for a date in mid July. I think I can accommodate that. Let me propose one to you and see if this works. I think it is a Thursday. It's July 17th at 9:30; is that workable for all of you?

MR. MOONEY: Yes, your Honor.

MR. HERNANDEZ: It's acceptable for the government, your Honor. Since Mr. Kurniawan is in custody, I don't know if

the marshals can produce him right at 9:30. 1 2 THE COURT: I'll work on that. I think they should be 3 able to do that. So, okay, anybody have anything else they want to 4 5 discuss? 6 MR. HERNANDEZ: No. Thank you. 7 THE COURT: Good. This is very helpful. 8 And I think this will give rise to a better record for 9 sentencing when we get this information nailed down. 10 Thanks. Nice to see you all. 11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. 12 MR. MOONEY: Thank you. 13 (Adjourned) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25